



2244
AF

[11403/12]

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re Application of:

Mark Klausner et al.

For: AUTONOMOUS IN VEHICLE
NAVIGATION SYSTEM AND
DIAGNOSTIC SYSTEM

X

Examiner: Thu V. Nguyen

Filed: December 13, 2001

Serial No.: 10/017,093

I hereby certify that the enclosed is being deposited with the
United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail
in an envelope addressed to:

Mail Stop APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF - PATENT
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date:

Signature:

AARON C. DEDITCH

**REPLACEMENT APPEAL BRIEF TRANSMITTAL
IN RESPONSE TO A NOTIFICATION OF NON-COMPLIANCE
AND PETITION TO EXTEND UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)**

SIR:

Accompanying this Appeal Brief Transmittal is a Replacement Appeal Brief pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.37 (in triplicate as a courtesy) for filing in the above-identified patent application, in response to the Notification of Non-Compliance mailed on April 21, 2006.

This is also a **Petition To Extend** Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) to extend the one-month response date by three (3) months from the one-month date of May 21, 2006 to August 21, 2006. Please charge the three-month extension fee of \$1,020.00 to respond to the Notification of Non-Compliance to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

(It is noted that the appropriate appeal brief fee of \$500.00, which is the Appeal Brief fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(c) was already paid when the first Appeal Brief was mailed on December 13, 2004 (and filed on December 16, 2004) and therefore should not be charged again to the extent already charged).

The Commissioner is also authorized, as necessary and/or appropriate, to charge any additional and appropriate fees, including any further Rule 136(a) extension fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-0600. Two duplicate copies of this transmittal are enclosed for these purposes.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated:

By:

Gerard A. Messina

(Reg. No. 35,952)

KENYON & KENYON LLP

One Broadway

New York, New York 10004

(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646

08/25/2006 YPOLITE1 00000041 110600 10017093

01 FC:1401 500.00 DA

08/25/2006 YPOLITE1 00000042 110600 10017093

01 FC:1402 500.00 DA

08/25/2006 YPOLITE1 00000041 110600 10017093

02 NY0123206410 v1 1020.00 DA



[11403/12]

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

----- X
In re Application of: :
Mark Klausner et al. :
For: AUTONOMOUS IN VEHICLE :
NAVIGATION SYSTEM AND :
DIAGNOSTIC SYSTEM :
Filed: December 13, 2001 : Art Unit: 3661
Serial No.: 10/017,093 :

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the
United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail
in an envelope addressed to:
Mail Stop APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date: 8/21/2006

Signature: [Signature]

AARON C. DEDITCH
(33,865)

REPLACEMENT APPEAL BRIEF PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 41.37

SIR:

In the above-identified patent application ("the present application"), Appellants mailed a Notice Of Appeal on September 10, 2004 (which was filed by the Patent Office on September 13, 2004) from the Final Office Action mailed by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on June 15, 2004, so that the two-month appeal brief filing date was November 13, 2004, which was extended by one month to December 13, 2004 by the prior Appeal Brief Transmittal and Petition to Extend, for which the original Appeal Brief was timely filed. In the Final Office Action, claims 20 to 26 and 29 to 39 were finally rejected.

An Amendment After A Final Office Action was mailed on July 29, 2004. An Advisory Action was mailed on August 17, 2004. *As stated in the Advisory Action, for purposes of the appeal, the Amendment was entered by the Examiner. It is also understood that any other amendments to date have also been entered.*

The Appeal Brief filed on December 16, 2004 (and mailed on December 13, 2004) in triplicate in support of the appeal of the final rejections of the claims was deemed non-compliant in the Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief (37 CFR 41.370) of April 21,

2006, in which it was stated that certain sections were missing from the Appeal Brief of December 16, 2004, in particular, the "Summary of claimed subject matter" as set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(v), the "Grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal" as set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vi), the "Evidence appendix", as set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(ix), and the "Related proceedings appendix", as set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(x).

To facilitate matters, the sections have been added and/or revised in accordance with 37 CFR 41.37. Approval and entry are respectfully requested.

It is respectfully submitted that all matters have been corrected and that this Replacement Appeal Brief complies with 37 CFR 41.37, and specifically moots the stated reasons for deeming the Appeal Brief filed on December 16, 2004 as non-compliant, so that this Replacement Appeal Brief is compliant.

Also, as to the length of the "concise explanation" of the subject matter defined in each of the claims involved in the appeal (see 41.37), the "concise explanation" language is like the "concise explanation" requirement of former Rule 37 CFR 1.192. Accordingly, the length of the concise explanation provided should be acceptable, since it would have been acceptable under 37 CFR 1.192 and since it specifically defines the subject matter of the independent claims involved in the appeal. In the filing of many appeal briefs under the old rules for the present Assignee, the length of the "concise explanation" has always been accepted by the Patent Office.

Although no longer required by the rules, this Appeal Brief is being submitted in triplicate in support of the appeal of the final rejections of claims 20 to 26 and 29 to 39. It is respectfully submitted that the final rejections of claims 20 to 26 and 29 to 39 should be reversed for the reasons set forth below.

1. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest in the present appeal is Robert Bosch GmbH ("Robert Bosch") of Stuttgart in the Federal Republic of Germany. Robert Bosch is the assignee of the entire right, title and interest in the present application.

2. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no interferences or other appeals related to the present application, which "will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal".

3. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1 to 19 are withdrawn and claims 27 and 28 are canceled.

A. Claims 20 to 26 and 29 to 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Van Bosch, U.S. Patent No. 6,493,629 (the "Van Bosch" reference) in view of Hanson et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication. No. 2002/0156558 (the "Hanson" reference).

Appellants therefore appeal from the final rejections of claims 20 to 26 and 29 to 39. A copy of all of the pending and appealed claims 20 to 26 and 29 to 39 is attached hereto in the Claims Appendix.

4. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

In response to the Final Office Action mailed on June 15, 2004, Appellants filed an Amendment After A Final Office Action ("the Response After Final"), which was mailed on July 29, 2004.

As stated in the Advisory Action, for purposes of the appeal, the Amendment was entered by the Examiner. It is also understood that any other amendments to date have also been entered.

5. SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The concise explanation of the summary of the claimed subject matter is as follows:

Independent claim 20 relates to a system for monitoring at least one apparatus in a vehicle, the system including at least one sensor 11, a gateway node 15 and a processor 17. The at least one sensor 11 and the gateway node 15 are each situated in the vehicle and electrically coupled to a vehicle bus 12. The at least one sensor 11 senses the at least one error code of the at least one apparatus and communicates the at least one error code to the gateway node 15 via the vehicle bus 12 using a network protocol. The gateway node 15 includes a controller arrangement 13 and a first wireless protocol arrangement 14, the first wireless protocol arrangement 14 being coupled to the controller arrangement 13. The gateway node 15 communicates the at least one error code to the processor 17 via a second wireless protocol arrangement 16 that communicates with the first wireless protocol arrangement 14, using a wireless communication protocol. The at least one error code concerns diagnostics information and is accessible from the vehicle bus 12. (Specification, page 6, line 2 to page 7, line 17, and Figure 1).

Independent claim 33 relates to a method for monitoring at least one apparatus in a vehicle, the method including sensing, with at least one sensor 11 situated in the vehicle, at least one error code of the at least one apparatus, communicating, with the at least one sensor 11, the at least one error code to a gateway node 15 via the vehicle bus 12 using a network protocol, and communicating, from the gateway node 15 to a processor 17, the at least one error code to the processor 17 via a second wireless protocol arrangement 16 that communicates with a first wireless protocol arrangement 14 of the gateway node 15, using a wireless communication protocol. The at least one sensor 11 is electrically coupled to a vehicle bus 12 that is also electrically coupled to the gateway node 15, which is situated in the vehicle and includes a controller arrangement 13 to which the first wireless protocol arrangement 14 is coupled. The at least one error code includes diagnostics information and is accessible from the vehicle bus 12. (Specification, page 6, line 2 to page 7, line 17, and Figure 1; See also Specification, page 7, line 18 to page 8, line 12).

The exemplary embodiment of the present invention accesses a vehicle bus either for sensor data concerning vehicle motion for a navigation system, or for system health data for a vehicle diagnostic computer. By accessing vehicle data from a vehicle bus without the requirement of a physical connection, the exemplary system, method, and device of the present invention are intended to eliminate or reduce the problems (as discussed at pages 1 and 2 of the Specification), and to enable a navigation system to take advantage of vehicle

sensor values to improve a position solution for the vehicle, and to enable diagnostics information from the vehicle bus to be accessed at a remote terminal, thereby allowing the user to display and analyze vehicle diagnostics on a handheld computer or other appropriate unit. (Specification, page 3, lines 13 to 21).

The exemplary system for navigating a vehicle includes a vehicle sensor connected to a vehicle bus connected to a gateway node, and a processor in the vehicle communicating wirelessly with the gateway node and connected to a vehicle positioning system. The sensor measures a value and then transmits the value over the vehicle bus to the gateway node using a network protocol. The gateway node then wirelessly transmits the value to the processor using a wireless communication protocol. The processor receives an initial position from the positioning device and calculates a current position using a former position, the initial position, and the sensor value. (Specification, page 3, line 22 to page 4, line 6).

An exemplary system for monitoring an apparatus in a vehicle includes a sensor for sensing an error code of the apparatus, a gateway node electrically coupled to the vehicle bus, and a processor. The processor may be situated within the vehicle, in proximity to the vehicle, or in long range wireless contact (e.g., by a cellphone connection) with the short range wireless hardware. The sensor, either in response to an interrogatory from a diagnostics software or on its own initiative, communicates the error code to the gateway node via the vehicle bus using a network protocol. The gateway node communicates the error code to the processor using a wireless communication protocol. The processor either displays the error code, uses a look-up table to analyze the error code, or stores the error code for retrieval at a later time. (Specification, page 4, line 22 to page 5, line 7).

Figure 1 shows a block diagram of a specific CAN-to-Bluetooth embodiment of the presently claimed subject matter. Any wireless communication system, however, could be used to connect the vehicle sensor to the processor. Figure 1 shows a sensor 11 electrically coupled to a vehicle bus 12. In one embodiment, the sensor data is used to assist in positioning the vehicle, and therefore any variable, both measured and observed (e.g. derived from other measured signals, using models), showing direction, change of direction, speed, acceleration, or deceleration, would be useful in the positioning calculation. Sensor 11 may therefore be a wheel speed sensor, a velocity sensor, a yaw rate sensor, a steering angle sensor, a body-slip angle sensor, an attitude sensor, an inertial sensor, or any other sensor for data concerning the status of a vehicle. (Specification, page 6, lines 1 to 11).

The vehicle bus 12 operates in one exemplary embodiment under a CAN (Controller Area Network) protocol. Vehicle bus 12 may be any one of several vehicle bus systems present in the vehicle, and is electrically coupled to gateway node 15. Gateway node 15, including controller 13 and Bluetooth hardware 14, is situated in the vehicle. Vehicle bus 12 couples directly to controller 13, which is electrically coupled to Bluetooth hardware 14. The controller 13 controls the communication between the vehicle bus 12 and the Bluetooth hardware 14, which communicates wirelessly with remote Bluetooth hardware 16 (Specification, page 6, lines 12 to 21).

Figure 2 illustrates a flowchart for the exemplary decision process of an exemplary diagnostic device according to the present invention starting in circle 21. The device determines if there has been an interrogatory from the diagnostic computer regarding status of the device in decision diamond 22. If the answer is “yes,” the flow is to decision diamond 23, while if the answer is “no,” the flow is to decision diamond 24. Decision diamond 23 asks whether there is an error code. If the answer is “no,” the flow is to box 25, while if the answer is “yes,” the flow is to box 26. Box 25 indicates an “all OK” signal is transmitted to the diagnostic computer. Box 26 indicates an error signal is transmitted to the diagnostic computer. Decision diamond 24 asks whether there is an error code. If the answer is “yes,” the flow is to box 26, while if the answer is “no,” the flow is to box 27. Box 26, as noted above, indicates an error signal is transmitted to the diagnostic computer. Box 27 indicates that no action is taken. (Specification, page 10, lines 3 to 13).

In summary, the presently claimed subject matter is therefore directed to a system for monitoring at least one apparatus in a vehicle, including: at least one sensor situated in the vehicle for sensing at least one error code of the at least one apparatus, the at least one sensor being electrically coupled to a vehicle bus; a gateway node situated in the vehicle, the gateway node being electrically coupled to the vehicle bus, the at least one sensor for communicating the at least one error code to the gateway node via the vehicle bus using a network protocol, the gateway node including a controller arrangement and a first wireless protocol arrangement, the first wireless protocol arrangement being coupled to the controller arrangement; and a processor, the gateway node communicating the at least one error code to the processor via a second wireless protocol arrangement that communicates with the first wireless protocol arrangement, using a wireless communication protocol, in

which at least one error code concerns diagnostics information and is accessible from the vehicle bus. (See claim 20).

The presently claimed subject matter is also therefore directed to a method for monitoring at least one apparatus in a vehicle, the method including: sensing, with at least one sensor situated in the vehicle, at least one error code of the at least one apparatus, wherein the at least one sensor is electrically coupled to a vehicle bus that is also electrically coupled to a gateway node situated in the vehicle, communicating, with the at least one sensor, the at least one error code to the gateway node via the vehicle bus using a network protocol, wherein the gateway node includes a controller arrangement and a first wireless protocol arrangement, and the first wireless protocol arrangement is coupled to the controller arrangement; and communicating, from the gateway node to a processor, the at least one error code to the processor via a second wireless protocol arrangement that communicates with the first wireless protocol arrangement, using a wireless communication protocol, in which the at least one error code includes diagnostics information and is accessible from the vehicle bus. (See claim 33).

Finally, the appealed claims include no means-plus-function language and no step-plus-function claims, so that 37 C.F.R. 41.37(v) is satisfied as to its specific requirements for such claims, since none are present here. Also, the present application does not contain any step-plus-function claims because the method claims in the present application are not “step plus function” claims because they do not recite “a step for”, as required by the Federal Circuit and as stated in Section 2181 of the MPEP.

6. GROUNDS FOR REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

A. Whether, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), claims 20 to 26 and 29 to 39 are patentable over Van Bosch, U.S. Patent No. 6,493,629 (the “Van Bosch” reference) in view of Hanson et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication. No. 2002/0156558 (the “Hanson” reference)?

7. ARGUMENT

A. The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) That Claims 20 to 26 and 29 to 39 Are Obvious Over the References Relied Upon

Claims 20 to 26 and 29 to 39 are currently pending and being considered (since claims 1 to 19 were withdrawn from consideration since they were restricted).

Claims 20 to 26 and 29 to 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Van Bosch, U.S. Patent No. 6,493,629 (the “Van Bosch” reference) in view of Hanson et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication. No. 2002/0156558 (the “Hanson” reference).

Claims 20 to 26 and 29 to 39

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of the references does not render obvious the subject matter of claims 20 to 26 and 29 to 39.

The Office Actions to date admit that the “Van Bosch” reference does not disclose a sensor for transmitting error code that concerns diagnostic information, nor a sensor that is coupled to the controller by a vehicle bus. (Office Action; page 2, ll. 2-4). The Office Actions to date conclusorily assert that these features are taught by the “Hanson” and “Lang” references. The combination of the references, even including the “Hanson” reference (which may not be prior art) does not render obvious the subject matter of claim 20.

Claim 20 is directed to a system for monitoring at least one apparatus in a vehicle including: at least one sensor situated in the vehicle for sensing at least one error code of the at least one apparatus, the at least one sensor being electrically coupled to a vehicle bus; a gateway node situated in the vehicle, *the gateway node being electrically coupled to the vehicle bus, the at least one sensor for communicating the at least one error code to the gateway node via the vehicle bus using a network protocol*, the gateway node including a controller arrangement and a first wireless protocol arrangement, the first wireless protocol arrangement being coupled to the controller arrangement; and a processor, the gateway node communicating the at least one error code to the processor via a second wireless protocol arrangement that communicates with the first wireless protocol arrangement, using a wireless communication protocol, *in which the at least one error code concerns diagnostics information and is accessible from the vehicle bus*.

As explained in the present application, this system provides the benefit of providing for a remote diagnostics system that obtains information from the vehicle bus:

In another embodiment, the sensor data is used in a diagnostic procedure to evaluate the vehicle systems. Sensor 11 may therefore also be any type of sensor evaluating another vehicle system or, alternatively, any system with self-diagnosing capabilities (i.e. any system capable of evaluating its own status). . . .

The status of sensor 11 might be communicated to the vehicle bus 12, where the controller 13 could read the status off the bus and communicate it to Bluetooth hardware 14 (or any other appropriate short-range wireless transmitter). Bluetooth hardware 14 might transmit the status code to remote Bluetooth hardware set 16 (or another short-range wireless transmitter). Remote Bluetooth hardware set might communicate the status code to processor 17, which might be a handheld computer running a diagnostic program. . . .

(Specification, pages 8 and 9).

The “Van Bosch” reference does not disclose or suggest, in the context of the claimed subject matter of claim 20, a gateway node to which the at least one sensor communicates at least one error code via the vehicle bus using a network protocol. The Office Actions to date apparently relies on all three references, the “Van Bosch”, the “Hanson”, and the “Lang” references in asserting that the combination of the references renders the subject matter of this claim obvious. However, the Office Actions to date identify various discrete elements of claim 20 and suggests their combination without providing a motivation for the combination. Additionally, none of the references discloses a gateway node that is electrically coupled to a vehicle bus in which a sensor communicates an error code to the gateway node via the vehicle bus. It is therefore respectfully requested that the obviousness rejection of claim 20 be withdrawn, since claim 20 is allowable, as are its dependent claims 21 to 26 and 29 to 32.

Claim 33 includes features like those of claim 20 and is therefore allowable for essentially the same reasons as claim 20. Claims 34 to 39 depend from claim 33, and are therefore allowable for the same reasons as claim 33.

In summary, it is respectfully submitted that claims 20 to 26 and 29 to 39 are allowable.

As further regards all of the obviousness rejections discussed herein, in rejecting a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the *Office* bears the initial burden of presenting a prima facie case of obviousness. In re Rijckaert, 9 F.3d 1531, 1532, 28 U.S.P.Q.2d 1955, 1956 (Fed. Cir. 1993). To establish prima facie obviousness, three criteria must be satisfied. First, there

must be some suggestion or motivation to modify or combine reference teachings. In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). This teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination must be found in the prior art and not based on the application disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. In re Merck & Co., Inc., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 U.S.P.Q. 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Third, the prior art reference(s) must teach or suggest all of the claim features. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974). Thus, to reject a claim as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the prior art must disclose or suggest each claim element and it must also suggest combining the features in the manner contemplated by the claim. (See Northern Telecom, Inc. v. Datapoint Corp., 908 F.2d 931, 934 (Fed. Cir. 1990), cert. denied, 111 S. Ct. 296 (1990); In re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 834 (Fed. Cir. 1990)).

Moreover, the “problem confronted by the inventor must be considered in determining whether it would have been obvious to combine the references in order to solve the problem.” (See Diversitech Corp. v. Century Steps, Inc., 850 F.2d 675, 679 (Fed. Cir. 1998)). It is respectfully submitted that, as discussed above, the references relied on, whether taken alone or combined, do not suggest in any way modifying or combining the references so as to provide the presently claimed subject matter for addressing the problems and/or providing the benefits discussed herein and in the specification, as explained above.

The cases of In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988), and In re Jones, 21 U.S.P.Q.2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992), also make plain that the Final Office Action's assertions that it would have been obvious to modify the reference relied upon does not properly support a § 103 rejection. It is respectfully suggested that those cases make plain that the Final Office Action reflects a subjective “obvious to try” standard, and therefore does not reflect the proper evidence to support an obviousness rejection based on the references relied upon. In particular, the Court in the case of In re Fine stated that:

Instead, the Examiner relies on hindsight in reaching his obviousness determination. . . .
One cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the prior art to deprecate the claimed invention.

In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d at 1600 (citations omitted; emphasis added). Likewise, the Court in the case of In re Jones stated that:

Before the PTO may combine the disclosures of two or more prior art references in order to establish *prima facie* obviousness, there must be some suggestion for doing so, found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. . . .

Conspicuously missing from this record is any evidence, other than the PTO's speculation (if it be called evidence) that one of ordinary skill . . . would have been motivated to make the modifications . . . necessary to arrive at the claimed [invention].

In re Jones, 21 U.S.P.Q.2d at 1943 & 1944 (citations omitted; italics in original).

That is exactly the case here since it is believed and respectfully submitted that the Office Actions to date reflect hindsight, reconstruction and speculation, which these cases have indicated does not constitute evidence that will support a proper obviousness finding.

More recently, the Federal Circuit in the case of In re Kotzab has made plain that even if a claim concerns a “technologically simple concept” — which is not even the case here, there still must be some finding as to the “specific understanding or principle within the knowledge of a skilled artisan” that would motivate a person having no knowledge of the claimed subject matter to “make the combination in the manner claimed”, stating that:

In this case, the Examiner and the Board fell into the hindsight trap. The idea of a single sensor controlling multiple valves, as opposed to multiple sensors controlling multiple valves, is a technologically simple concept. *With this simple concept in mind, the Patent and Trademark Office found prior art statements that in the abstract appeared to suggest the claimed limitation. But, there was no finding as to the specific understanding or principle within the knowledge of a skilled artisan that would have motivated one with no knowledge of Kotzab's invention to make the combination in the manner claimed.* In light of our holding of the absence of a motivation to combine the teachings in Evans, we conclude that the Board did not make out a proper *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting [the] claims . . . under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) over Evans.

(See In re Kotzab, 55 U.S.P.Q.2d 1313, 1318 (Federal Circuit 2000) (*italics added*)). Here again, it is believed that there have been no such findings to establish that the features discussed above of the rejected claims are met by the reference relied upon. As referred to above, any review of the reference relied upon makes plain that it simply does not describe the features discussed above of the claims as now presented.

More recent still, in the case of *In re Lee*, 61 U.S.P.Q.2d 1430, 1433-35 (Fed. Cir. 2002), the Court reversed the Board of Appeals for relying on conclusory statements, stating the following:

With respect to Lee's application, neither the examiner nor the Board adequately supported the selection and combination of the Nortrup and Thunderchopper references to render obvious that which Lee described. The examiner's conclusory statements that "the demonstration mode is just a programmable feature which can be used in many different device[s] for providing automatic introduction by adding the proper programming software" and that "another motivation would be that the automatic demonstration mode is user friendly and it functions as a tutorial" do not adequately address the issue of motivation to combine. This factual question of motivation is material to patentability, and could not be resolved on subjective belief and unknown authority. It is improper, in determining whether a person of ordinary skill would have been led to this combination of references, simply to "[use] that which the inventor taught against its teacher." Thus the Board must not only assure that the requisite findings are made, based on evidence of record, but must also explain the reasoning by which the findings are deemed to support the agency's conclusion.

....

In its decision on Lee's patent application, the Board rejected the need for "any specific hint or suggestion in a particular reference" to support the combination of the Nortrup and Thunderchopper references. Omission of a relevant factor required by precedent is both legal error and arbitrary agency action.

[The] “common knowledge and common sense” on which the Board relied in rejecting Lee’s application are not the specialized knowledge and expertise contemplated by the Administrative Procedure Act. Conclusory statements such as those here provided do not fulfill the agency’s obligation. [The] Board’s findings must extend to all material facts and must be documented on the record, lest the “haze of so-called expertise” acquire insulation from accountability. “Common knowledge and common sense,” even if assumed to derive from the agency’s expertise, do not substitute for authority when the law requires authority.

Thus, the proper evidence of obviousness must show why there is a suggestion as to the reference so as to provide the subject matter of the claims and its benefits.

Accordingly, and in view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the Office Actions to date unsupportedly assert that it would have been obvious to replace the sensors 120 (fig. 2) of “Hanson” with the sensors of “Lang” and to connect the sensor to the system bus of Bosch to provide diagnostic information of the vehicle subsystems to the wireless device 130 (fig. 2) does not provide sufficient motivation to support the combination. The only motivation to combine the references comes from the disclosure of the present application, which constitutes improper hindsight reasoning. Since there is no motivation or suggestion to combine the references, the references do not render the subject matter of the claims obvious, as explained herein.

In short, there is no evidence that the reference relied upon, whether taken alone or otherwise, would provide the features of the claims discussed above. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the claims are allowable for these reasons.

As further regards all of the obviousness rejections of the claims, it is respectfully submitted that not even a *prima facie* case has been made in the present case for obviousness, since the Office Actions to date never made any findings, such as, for example, regarding in any way whatsoever what a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been at the time the claimed subject matter of the present application was made. (See *In re Rouffet*, 47 U.S.P.Q.2d 1453, 1455 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (the “factual predicates underlying” a *prima facie* “obviousness determination include the scope and content of the prior art, the differences between the prior art and the claimed invention, and the level of ordinary skill in the art”)).

It is respectfully submitted that the proper test for showing obviousness is what the “combined teachings, knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and the nature of the problem to be solved as a whole would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art”, and that the Patent Office must provide particular findings in this regard — the evidence for which does not include “broad conclusory statements standing alone”. (See *In re Kotzab*, 55 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (citing *In re Dembiczak*, 50 U.S.P.Q.2d 1614, 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (obviousness rejections reversed where no findings were made “concerning the identification of the relevant art”, the “level of ordinary skill in the art” or “the nature of the problem to be solved”))). It is respectfully submitted that there has been no such showings by the Office Actions to date or by the Advisory Action.

In fact, the present lack of any of the required factual findings forces both Appellants and this Board to resort to unwarranted speculation to ascertain exactly what facts underly the present obviousness rejections. The law mandates that the allocation of the proof burdens requires that the Patent Office provide the factual basis for rejecting a patent application under 35 U.S.C. § 103. (See *In re Piasecki*, 745 F.2d 1468, 1472, 223 U.S.P.Q. 785, 788 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (citing *In re Warner*, 379 F.2d 1011, 1016, 154 U.S.P.Q. 173, 177 (C.C.P.A. 1967))). In short, the Examiner bears the initial burden of presenting a proper prima facie unpatentability case — which has not been met in the present case. (See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24, U.S.P.Q.2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992)).

In short, all of claims 20 to 26 and 29 to 39 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of claims 20 to 26 and 29 to 39 be reversed, and that these claims be allowed as presented.

Dated: 8/21/2006

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Gerard A. Messina
(Reg. No. 35,952)
KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646

CLAIMS APPENDIX

1-19. (Withdrawn).

20. (Previously Presented) A system for monitoring at least one apparatus in a vehicle comprising:

at least one sensor situated in the vehicle for sensing at least one error code of the at least one apparatus, the at least one sensor being electrically coupled to a vehicle bus;

a gateway node situated in the vehicle, the gateway node being electrically coupled to the vehicle bus, the at least one sensor for communicating the at least one error code to the gateway node via the vehicle bus using a network protocol, the gateway node including a controller arrangement and a first wireless protocol arrangement, the first wireless protocol arrangement being coupled to the controller arrangement; and

a processor, the gateway node communicating the at least one error code to the processor via a second wireless protocol arrangement that communicates with the first wireless protocol arrangement, using a wireless communication protocol;

wherein the at least one error code concerns diagnostics information and is accessible from the vehicle bus.

21. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 20, wherein the wireless communication protocol includes a Bluetooth protocol, the first wireless protocol arrangement includes a first Bluetooth hardware arrangement, and the second wireless protocol arrangement includes a second Bluetooth hardware arrangement.

22. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 21, wherein the network protocol includes a Controller Area Network protocol.

23. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 22, wherein the gateway node includes a Controller Area Network/Bluetooth gateway node.

24. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 20, wherein the at least one sensor interrogates the at least one apparatus for the at least one error code when a request is received from a user.

25. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 20, wherein the at least one apparatus is at least one of a brake system, an engine system, an electrical system, and an auxiliary system.

26. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 20, further comprising:

a cellphone communicator electrically coupled to the processor; and

a remote application for communicating with the cellphone communicator via a cellphone base station;

wherein the remote application is for receiving the at least one error code.

27. (Canceled).

28. (Canceled).

29. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 20, wherein the processor compares the at least one error code to a look-up table to determine a status code.

30. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 29, wherein the status code is communicated to a user.

31. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 30, wherein the status code is communicated to a user by at least one of a visual display unit and an audible signal.

32. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 20, wherein the processor is in a hand-held computer to enable a user to display and analyze vehicle diagnostics on the handheld computer.

33. (Previously Presented) A method for monitoring at least one apparatus in a vehicle, the method comprising:

sensing, with at least one sensor situated in the vehicle, at least one error code of the at least one apparatus, wherein the at least one sensor is electrically coupled to a vehicle bus that is also electrically coupled to a gateway node situated in the vehicle,

communicating, with the at least one sensor, the at least one error code to the gateway node via the vehicle bus using a network protocol, wherein the gateway node includes a controller arrangement and a first wireless protocol arrangement, and the first wireless protocol arrangement is coupled to the controller arrangement; and

communicating, from the gateway node to a processor, the at least one error code to the processor via a second wireless protocol arrangement that communicates with the first wireless protocol arrangement, using a wireless communication protocol;

wherein the at least one error code includes diagnostics information and is accessible from the vehicle bus.

34. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 33, further comprising:

comparing by the processor the at least one error code to a look-up table to determine a status code.

35. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 34, further comprising:

communicating the status code to a user.

36. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 35, further comprising:

communicating the status code to a user by at least one of a visual display unit and an audible signal.

37. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 36, further comprising:

interrogating by the at least one sensor the at least one apparatus for the at least one error code when a request is received from the user.

38. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 33, wherein the wireless communication protocol includes a Bluetooth protocol, the first wireless protocol arrangement includes a first Bluetooth hardware arrangement, and the second wireless protocol arrangement includes a second Bluetooth hardware arrangement.

39. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 38, wherein the network protocol includes a Controller Area Network protocol.

U.S. Application Serial No. 10/017,093
Atty. Docket No. 11403/12
Replacement Appeal Brief

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

No evidence has been submitted pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§1.130, 1.131, or 1.132. No other evidence has been entered by the Examiner or relied upon by Appellant in the appeal.

U.S. Application Serial No. 10/017,093
Atty. Docket No. 11403/12
Replacement Appeal Brief

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

There are no interferences or other appeals related to the present application.